

Re: PCT International Application No. PCT/IN03/00352

dated 04/11/2003

Applicant : GUHA, Dwipendra Nath

Entitled "THREE-DIMENSIONAL MAZE GAME"

Applicant's Agent File Ref : FPAA363PCT

STATEMENT UNDER ARTICLE 19

The applicant wishes to clarify that there are multiple points of difference between maze game of the present invention and the puzzle device taught in WO 92/19338. Such differences are in the form of both constructional and conceptual so that the challenge thrown and the physical/mental dexterity required to solve the game is vastly different. The critical differences are described as under.

- 1) The maze game of the present invention comprises intersecting pathways while the puzzle device of WO 92/19338 is formed of plurality of chambers with openings therebetween such that a passage is defined from the starting point through the chambers to an end chamber.
- 2) Since the puzzle device of WO 92/19338 is formed of unit chambers, the object moves through the same distance in every step and it is not possible to provide varying pathways for the object to travel in each step of the game. On the contrary, the pathways of the maze game of the present invention may be of varying lengths thereby providing bigger challenge to the player in formulating the strategy for solving the game. Claim 1 has now been amended to define this feature which is apparent from the accompanying drawings.
- 3) It is possible to provide blind pathways in the maze game of the present invention by way of which substantial mental dexterity is required and it is also possible to vary the complexity of the game by selection of the number of such blind pathways. Claim 1 has now been amended by incorporating this feature. Support is found under detailed description in pages 6 and 7 as well as the accompanying drawings. A preferred number of blind pathways is also defined in subclaim 4
- 4) In playing the puzzle device of WO 92/19338, the challenge is not in reaching from start to finish chamber, but to achieve this feat by minimum time and terms. On the contrary, in the present invention, the object will be lost in a blind pathway if the object is not turned in correct sequence and the game has to be restarted all over again.
- 5) In the puzzle device of WO 92/19338 the end chamber becomes the start chamber for the next round of game while in the present invention the start and exit apertures are not interchangeable.
- 6) The maze game of the present invention may have more than one exit apertures compared to the puzzle device of WO 92/19338 which has only one end chamber. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify this feature.
- 7) The puzzle device of WO 92/19338 does not comprise any means to bring the object to rest till the toy is tilted.